

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

WAYA TSALAGI JONES,

Plaintiff,

V.

STEVE RUSSELL,

Defendant.

4:11CV3120

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the court on its own motion. The above-captioned matter was provisionally filed on July 25, 2011. (Filing No. 1.) However, due to certain technical defects, the Complaint cannot be further processed until such defects are corrected. To assure further consideration of the Complaint, Plaintiff must correct the defect listed below. **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE DEFECT MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE PETITION.**

Plaintiff has failed to include the \$350.00 filing fee. Plaintiff has the choice of either tendering the \$350.00 fee to the Clerk of the court or submitting a request to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of poverty in support thereof. If Plaintiff chooses to do the latter, the enclosed pauper's forms should be completed and returned to this court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff is directed to correct the above-listed technical defect in the Complaint on or before **September 19, 2011**.
2. Failure to comply with this Memorandum and Order will result in dismissal of this matter without further notice.

3. The Clerk of the court is directed to send to Plaintiff the Form AO240, Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit.

4. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this matter with the following text: **September 19, 2011**: deadline for payment or filing of IFP application.

DATED this 17th day of August, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.